

# THE CATHOLIC MIND

Vol. XXXVI

APRIL 22, 1938

No. 848

## The Perils of Democracy

WILFRID PARSONS, S.J.

*Reprinted from Columbia, the issue of March, 1938.*

**I**N by far the largest part of Europe democracy has almost disappeared, at least democracy as we know it. It has been succeeded in Italy, the Balkans, Hungary, Austria, Poland, Russia, Germany, Spain, and Portugal by some kind of an absolute government. That leaves Belgium, Holland, France, Great Britain and Ireland, Czechoslovakia, and Scandinavia still within the ranks of the self-governing nations, or a population of only 131,800,000 out of 550,000,000—less than twenty-five per cent. And as I write, France, with 42,000,000 population, is tottering on the brink of a revolution.

The very idea of democracy is being changed everywhere. The proof of that is that it is the commonest thing in the world now to read that Russia is a democracy. Now if Russia is a democracy, then that word has undergone in the minds of those who use it a profound change. Democracy, since the days of St. Thomas Aquinas, has meant self-government by the people through elected representatives. It implies the recognition by the government of certain inherent inalienable rights, which are no gift of the government

but pre-existing to it and guaranteed by it. Russia recently had an election and in all but less than one per cent of the election districts the people had the "choice" of only one candidate for office and him chosen by the Communist party. That election, curiously enough also, was preceded and followed by wholesale slaughter of members of the party who were accused in one way or another of harboring political ideas contrary to those which happened at the moment to be entertained by the Oriental despot who runs the country from his desk at the Kremlin at Moscow. That may be democracy, but it is an entirely novel brand. When Hitler did the very same thing in 1934, Germany was denounced for being anti-democratic.

At the same time we have witnessed a determined propaganda drive to line up Russia with the really democratic nations, apparently on the sole ground that Fascism is the enemy of Communism and also rejects democracy in the countries where it holds sway. The logic of this is that if I am fighting two men, one on my left and one on my right, then that is not two men but the same identical man. The effect of this on people's minds is something pretty terrible to contemplate. It means that democracy is no longer the rule of justice and fair play, but the reign of force and violence. This, of course, is what the propagandists want.

Now there is one thing that has been true of our Left Wingers in the past. They were pacifists and they were proud of it. In fact, to some people pacifism and Communism were part of one and the same thing. The Reds did nothing to dispel this notion. There was supposed to be something superior about their preachments because more than all others they wanted peace. It was they who pulled the strings of the League against War and Fascism. It was they who brought into this country the famous Oxford Oath, by which young people swore never to take arms for their coun-

try for any cause whatsoever, just or unjust. It was they who fomented the annual peace strikes in the high schools and colleges.

What has happened to their pacifism? All gone. They are the war party now in every country where they exist. A year ago it was claimed that 300,000 students supported the Oath. Last Christmas, at the annual meeting at Vassar College of the National Students Union, which was supposed to represent the same 300,000 young people, the leaders told them the Oxford Oath was now all wrong, and had them repudiate it. What they talked about now was war, and they glorified as heroes the thousands of foreigners fighting against Franco in Spain. They want us now to go to war against Italy and Germany and Japan. It is the duty, they say, of the democracies. Of course, if in performing that duty we also incidentally saved Russia and Communism from being crushed by those Powers, they would not object particularly.

That is what has changed our Left-wing pacifists into raging war mongers. When it looked as if England and France and the United States might some day unite again to drive Communism out of Russia and the world, they preached pacifism to us, and disarmament and all the rest of it, and made villains of the munitions manufacturers. But now when it looks as if these same countries are enemies of Fascism and might clash with it, why disarmament is all wrong, war is glorious, and the munitions makers the saviors of humanity.

The fact of the matter is that the principal interest of the Communists and their sympathizers is now the organization of public opinion to preserve Stalin in power and to forward the imperialistic yearnings of the Russian regime. The original simon-pure Communists are called Trotzkyists, and if they remained in Russia they are now all dead. Russia is resuming the place it once had as a pre-War military Power, and

it is seeking with the help of Great Britain and France to expand its influence in Eastern Europe and Western Asia. That is where we come in. We are to come to the rescue once again of all democracies, including Russia.

It is a blundering sort of policy. In a new World War Germany would have Italy on her side this time and also Japan, where before they were on ours. We would be occupied in the Pacific much more than in the Atlantic, and could give precious little help with our Navy to France and England. England, at least, sees this, and that is why she is ready to suffer any humiliation from Italy and Germany rather than be made the cat's-paw of this stupid Russian internationalism.

As usual, however, the wool is being pulled over our eyes. Our newspaper and magazine editors seem to have pretty nearly all fallen for the notion that democracy is once again at stake in Russia's quarrels. Yet even they should know that if we get into a war, democracy not only in the world at large but even more so at home will receive a blow from which it may never recover. The new doctrine that wars are struggles of whole people and not merely of paid armies will see to that. Everybody will immediately be put under martial law, for everybody will be presumed to be a combatant in some sense.

So there is the first set of the perils of democracy. They are all from the outside; but they will have, and are already having, a powerful influence inside. They are gradually changing among our people the very notion of democracy itself. True democracy, however, has its own troubles without importing any from the outside. By the very fact that it has failed in so many European and Latin American countries, it is more than ever on trial here at home. I am not speaking now of the unceasing attempts of the Communists and the Communist sympathizers to drive us into some sort of totalitarian State such as exists in Russia.

That is serious enough. Not so much, it seems to me, that the Communists will get very far in imposing a Marxian regime on us, as that the reaction to their attempts will destroy democracy equally as effectively.

The most immediate danger from Communism comes from the opposition that will organize to defeat it if it shows signs of getting too strong. Big business, small business, the whole white-collar class, the more prosperous workers in and out of the A. F. of L., in other words, most of our population, all of these will instinctively unite to protect their interests. That is all right; but the way they will unite will be to demand that the government use force in suppressing the Communist menace. Look how large numbers of indignant and unthinking citizens cried for armed force against the sit-down strikers last year.

That was only a taste of what will happen if the Communists get too strong. Censorship, denial of habeas corpus, of the right of association and of free meeting, and finally military law will be accepted easily, even eagerly, by large masses. That is the way Fascism comes. The Communists will not be the only ones to suffer; everybody will. People will give up their democracy with hardly a second thought if their property is threatened by a Communist revolution, or even by a series of Communist outbreaks. That is what happened successively in Hungary, Poland, Germany, Italy, and other countries where democracy seemed powerless to stem the Marxian tide. Fascism is not so much a danger to us in itself, as it will be in the reaction that will follow if Communism gets too strong. First will come the use of arms; and then a perverted theory of the State, and democracy will be no more.

At the same time, however, democracy is under heavy fire from the Fascist countries. In those places democracy failed, and so force stepped in to save the situation. It is still the belief of those countries that

this must happen everywhere. According to them, the machine has enchained humanity. It has become so complicated, so vast in its control, so incalculable in its results, that society is doomed to be forever its slave and the prey to recurrent depressions, each one worse than the last. The financial network behind the production of goods, they say, is so involved that nobody understands it. Money is too great a power to be left in the control of private persons. Democracy, they sneer, cannot hope to cope with this problem. It has brought about, by its doctrine of liberty, the very thing that will spell its finish. Only the absolute State, they conclude, can tame the machine. Leave it in private hands, or turn it over to collective ownership: it is the same. All the totalitarians are predicting that all democracies will come to their position in sheer self-defense. This is the first great challenge to democracy within its own borders. Can democracy meet it? We shall see.

Meanwhile another danger threatens from another side. The undoubted evils that have flowed from the industrial system have roused in many generous souls the yearning to bring about their cure. Social reform is the motivating force behind the appeal of Communism; just as it is, on the other side, the aim of the New Deal, just as it is the ideal of the Papal Encyclicals. But Fascism can come about from insistence on social reform just as it can come from resistance to it. If those who desire the reconstruction of the social order become convinced that the opposition to their plans is so strong that only the State can overcome it, then they, too, will have recourse to arming their government for violent action. And the irony of it is that they will do this in the name of human welfare, not as its enemies. Thus we can get Fascism, the overthrow of democracy, from one side or the other of the social debate.

Can democracy solve the problems of modern in-

dustrial existence, and still remain democracy? All the totalitarians, Fascist and Communist, say it cannot. You may leave property in private hands, as do the Fascists, or you may nationalize it, as do the Communists, but in either case you must have a State so absolute in its powers over human activities that all property will be rigidly controlled. Fascism and Communism profess the very same political doctrine, each from its side of the economic fence. There is no difference between them in political theory. They are both the denial of democracy, and they both deny it in the name of the liberation of mankind from the network of our complicated modern economic machine.

Must democracy follow along with them and commit suicide in the name of its own followers? There are two answers to this, or rather two attitudes that have been taken. And both attitudes seem to me to be wrong.

The first group do not even recognize that there is a problem. They are among those who derive their income from the profits made on goods, as distinct from those who live on the wages earned in producing them. This class will blandly tell you that if anybody is out of work it is his own fault. He simply does not want to work, they say. He would rather receive cash relief than a job. This class has never heard that even in 1929 more than forty per cent of our families had an income below what is generally recognized to be a decent living annual wage. It simply denies there is a social problem. The members of that class are the optimists. They harp so much on liberty, and tell themselves that everything is for the best in a beautiful world, that the realities of life pass them by. They are a great obstacle to democracy's solving its crucial problem, for they won't even admit that there is a problem. If they continue that way, one fine day they will wake up and find that the problem has been solved—in a way they will not like.

Then there are the pessimists. They see the problem, and very clearly. In fact they see it too well; to them it looms so menacing and dark that they despair of democracy ever being able to solve it at all. So their impulse is to step outside of democracy and solve it that way. In the back of their minds is the eternal hankering after the use of force to bring about reform. They see no other way of having it.

Now if our people are going to divide up along these lines, there is very little hope for poor democracy. If the pessimists have their way, and we plod for social reform without liberty, we have destroyed democracy. If we plod for liberty without social reform, democracy will have rushed blindly to destruction of itself.

What, then, lies before us? To answer this question we have first of all to remember that there is a social problem to be solved. The fate of democracy lies in its being able to prove that it can solve it, that the charges of Fascism and Communism that it cannot solve it are false. This charge, however, we will not refute by merely saying that it is false.

Yet it cannot be said that democracy has yet solved it. So far, it has preserved political liberty. Hugh Johnson can deliver a violent tirade against the Administration on the radio one evening, and wake up alive in his bed next morning. There are not very many countries left where that is possible. But democracy has yet to prove that it can preserve this liberty, and yet bring social welfare to the great masses of our people.

So the crucial debate of our times is to discover the way to have both liberty and social welfare at the same time. It is the search for the nice balance: not so much social legislation that private initiative will be crushed; not so little that human greed and ambition will ultimately bring our civilization crashing about our ears. Nobody can really understand what



is going on in our country unless he realizes that this is the struggle that is behind our labor and political differences. On the outcome of that struggle depends the whole future of democratic institutions.

## Catholic Teaching on Evolution

DANIEL LINEHAN, S.J.

*Address delivered over Station WNAC, Boston, on The Catholic Question Box program, January 2, 1938.*

THE question of the relations between science and religion is apparently one of the most absorbing of all questions to many people. Presumably this is the result of what is sometimes called the "Impact of modern science" on the whole life of man, especially in filling so munificently and effectively most, if not all, of his material needs; as well as in ministering to his bodily comfort and in providing him with so many luxuries. Science has done so many magnificently useful things in the world, that, when scientists declared, with an emphatic finality that science could be expected to fill all of man's spiritual needs as well as his material desires, there were not wanting listeners who decided that science had shown religion was unnecessary, and that it was probably nothing more than a myth.

Please note that I have said "some scientists" declared that religion had been displaced by science. Science did not say this; but some scientists did. And these scientists were wrong, as scientists can be when they generalize in fields that are far wider than the limits of their particular regions of investigation. As the late Father John J. Gerard, S.J., himself an emi-

nent botanist, was fond of saying: "There is a great difference between what science says and what scientists say." And the late Sir Oliver Lodge put it in a somewhat different manner when he declared: "Extreme skepticism and extreme dogmatism are very easy solutions of every difficulty, they both dispense with the necessity of reflection."

The thoughts which have just been expressed were suggested by the official press reports, of an address by Dr. Edward Grant Conklin of Princeton University, an eminent biologist, and retiring president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, at the recent meeting of that scientific body in Indianapolis.

It contains a general appeal to scientists to rally humanity against war and with this one can have nothing but the utmost sympathy, and could give nothing short of the utmost cooperation. And on his rallying-call to the scientists of the democratic countries to "use their utmost influence to see that intellectual freedom does not perish from the earth" we can insist as eloquently as he. We, too, can recognize the obligation incumbent on American scientists "who are the inheritors of the tradition of liberty of thought, speech and press, and who believe that freedom and responsibility are essential to all progress." But I must confess to a certain apprehension regarding the means which Dr. Conklin would suggest to maintain that freedom, and I must confess that I very emphatically disagree with the concept of freedom that he proposes.

#### SOUL CREATED BY GOD

"There is good evidence that even psychical properties, such as consciousness, intelligence and will, emerge in the process of development because of specific combinations of physical and psychical factors.

This is, indeed, the whole philosophy of evolution, namely, that the entire universe, including man and all his faculties and activities, are the results of transformation rather than of new formation, of emergence rather than of creation *de novo*."

This means, of course, that intellect and will arose by the evolution of physical and psychical factors. Is this true? Specifically did man's soul arise by evolution? Or was it created? The Catholic teaching is and has always been, and must always be, that the soul of each human being has been, and is now being, created directly by God. Let us consider this teaching of the Church a little more fully:

It is a matter of Catholic faith, defined in two general councils of the Church, the fourth Lateran Council, which was held in 1215, and the Vatican Council held in 1869-1870, that God by His omnipotent power, at the beginning of time, created man, that is, a human creature composed of body and soul. Hence no Catholic can subscribe to any theory of evolution that holds that man, both body and soul, evolved by natural causes from brute matter. The proof is, of course, from the revealed word of God, in the first chapter of Genesis, verses 26 and 27. "And he said: Let us make man to our image and likeness: and let him have dominion over the fishes of the sea, and the fowls of the air, and the beasts, and the whole earth, and every creeping creature that moveth upon the earth, and God created man to his own image: to the image of God he created him: male and female he created them." Another proof is found in the second chapter of Genesis, verse 7: "And the Lord God formed man out of the slime of the earth: and breathed into his face the breath of life and man became a living soul." There can be no doubt, then that scripture teaches that God is the Creator of man, a creature composed of body and soul. This is the unanimous teaching of Christian tradition.

## FALSE THEORIES OF EVOLUTION

There have been some writers who tried to prove that the creation of the soul was not a direct act of God, but that parents have had something to do with the generation of the soul, as they cooperate in the generation of the body. And of course, extreme Materialistic evolution would have it that the soul, as well as the body, was developed from such ancestors. Both of these views are opposed to Catholic teaching. The human soul is immediately created by God. This follows as a direct inference from the fact that the human soul is spiritual. This soul is spiritual is evident from certain acts of intellect and will which indicate that the soul, which is the principle of these acts, is intrinsically independent of the purely corporeal organism. That is what we mean by spiritual, intrinsic independence of matter or material organism. Such a spiritual being cannot originate as an emanation from God, for that would make it infinite and divine, which it is not, as is obvious; besides such an emanation is impossible. Nor can it be generated by the parents, for a spiritual soul is, as Catholic philosophy clearly shows, "essentially and integrally simple and indivisible," hence can give forth no germs nor reproductive elements." The only other intelligible source of the soul's existence is the creative act of God. Hence, if the soul is due now to the creative act of God, it must have always owed its origin to that creative act, for the nature of the soul was the same in the first human being as it is in all existing human beings, as it will be in the last man on earth. Hence we believe that the soul of the first man was not a product of evolution, but was a direct creation of God.

There are many texts of Scripture which contain this doctrine. I select three.

Ecclesiastes xii, 7: "And the dust return into its earth from whence it was, and the spirit return to

God who gave it." As St. Jerome over fifteen hundred years ago said of this passage: "It is clear that God, not men, is the father of Souls."

Hebrews xii, 5: "Moreover we have had fathers of our flesh, for instructors, and we revered them: shall we not much more obey the Father of spirits and live?" St. Paul here clearly contrasts body and soul, attributing the flesh to the parents and the soul to God. True the word he used is "spirit," but this word is frequently used in Scripture for "soul." That St. Paul uses it here in the sense of "soul" is clear from his contrasting it with "flesh" (body).

The direct creation of the soul is described also in Genesis ii, 7: "and breathed into his face the breath of life." By this "breath of life" man became a living soul, whereas before he was but the "slime of the earth." The "slime of the earth" refers to his body, as is the unanimous interpretation of scholars. This is the verdict of science also. To quote the late Sir Bertram Windle (*Evolution and Catholicity*—p. 31): "What is man's body made of, Flesh and bones, nerves, arteries, and muscles and the like. But what are they made of? A great deal of water enters into the composition of the human body but apart from that it consists of some twenty or more chemical elements which are all constituents of the earth's crust; so that in sober truth it is made of the slime of the earth, *i. e.*, water and dust, and after death will return to the slime of the earth, water and dust.

It is the fashion for some men of science to characterize this Catholic view as to the origin of the human soul as hopelessly antiquated and discredited. But apparently they are not aware that it is also the view of many men of science of great eminence so it must be a reasonable view. Therefore, since it favors both the scientific and the religious facts, the Catholic view deserves the assent of every reasonable man. Let us glance briefly at the conclusions of the men of

science to whom I have referred. Take first the eminent psychologist, Professor McDougall, formerly of Oxford and Harvard, now of Duke University.

In his scholarly work called *Body and Mind*, from a standpoint outside that of religion and revelation Dr. McDougall gives his verdict in favor of the existence of the human soul, on the lines familiar to Catholics in and out of seminaries. Indeed a student of philosophy in any Catholic college where the Scholastic philosophy is taught will easily recognize Dr. McDougall's arguments.

In his preface he says that "to many minds it must appear nothing short of a scandal that anyone occupying a position in an academy of learning, other than a Roman Catholic seminary, should in this twentieth century defend the old-world notion of the soul of man." Yet that is precisely what Dr. McDougall does, in spite of what appears to have been his initial prejudice against "The old-world notion."

The second eminent man of science whom I refer to is Alfred Russell Wallace, who propounded simultaneously with Darwin the theory of Natural Selection, in a way similar to that of Dr. McDougall came to the same conclusion about the soul, and concluded that the spiritual could not be explained except through the intervention of a creative act of God.

Especially striking is the testimony of a great English Zoologist, Professor Sedgewick of the Royal College of Science, London (Vol. 2—p. 665), who says:

"The mental qualities which are so characteristic of the *genus Homo* have led many naturalists to create a special family (*Anthropidæ*) or even order (*Bimana*) for its reception. But in this work we are concerned with man from the standpoint of morphology, and in assigning him his position in the system we can only take into consideration the facts of his bodily structure, as we have done in the case of the

other animals. If physical characters were taken into account in Zoology the whole of classification would be thrown into confusion; and in the case of man how should we define the position to be assigned to him? For what a piece of work is man! How noble in reason! how infinite in faculty! in form and moving how express and admirable! in action how like an angel; in apprehension how like a god!" And again—from the eighth psalm: "Thou has made him a little lower than the angels and hast crowned him with glory and honor."

## Writers for a New Catholic Generation!

F. GORDON O'NEILL

*Reprinted from The Franciscan, March, 1938.*

THE first generation of Catholics in this country, who are nearly all American-born, is approaching adulthood. The shutting off of immigration nearly a generation ago is the simple explanation of the fact that the vast majority of Catholics in the United States of America are Americans and are American-minded. As each year passes there are fewer Irish-minded, German-minded, Italian-minded, Slav-minded Catholics in this country. The young people are not interested in the old countries; there is no immigration to refresh continually the old-country interest.

The Irish-American Catholics understood one another. They had a sympathetic understanding, derived from their own experience, of the other immigrant groups as these did of them. But in the minds of the youth in the high schools and colleges today the

hyphenated Americanisms no longer have meaning. All that is going or gone. The last ten years have marked the change. What the new Catholic body is can only be understood by those who compose it, who observe its folk ways, who make note of its spoken thought.

Here is a new Church, a new social phenomenon needing description that it may understand itself. It can no longer be explained by racial traditions. The formal schools, public or parish, do not forward the old European traditions. The Catholic schools teach dogma. They do not carry on the ancestral folklore. They are new. They are starting a new generation into a society the external environment of which is different from that of every other country in the world.

The new generation takes for granted, as though they always were, the movies, the automobile, the radio, billboards, the photographic magazine, the pagan fiction, the factory, the subway, the public playgrounds, the rush. How the new generation explains life in terms of revelation and Christian morality has not been recorded.

The youngest Catholic editors are too old to appreciate this new point of view. They do not even know the language of the young American. What they write, what they offer to the young to read is generally unrealistic. It does not touch the life that is being lived. To describe the Catholic in America as observed locally, to narrate what he does and says, to show forth his mental processes in story, essay and play is the opportunity awaiting American Catholics with the itch to write.

Whether that itch exists or not I do not know. That it is inhibited I am sure. A diocesan paper that I watched closely a few years ago offered money every week for a short, short story, an essay and a poem. Some of the poetry received was good. Most of the essays were not worth printing. They were at best in-



different high-school compositions. The stories were full of sickly sentiment and were altogether unrealistic. They were imaginary. They did not describe Catholics as they were known. They were weak and weary tales made up of the whole cloth.

I was told not long ago by a man in a position to know that there were not five Catholic writers in Hollywood. As a matter of fact the only Catholic writer there I know of is not an American. I was asked what the Catholic schools are doing to develop writers. I could not answer, but I have a suspicion that our young people are not encouraged to set down their observations on Catholic life in America as they know it. They can dig an essay out of an encyclopedia. They separate their study of religion from their observation of life as they experience it.

No great lure has been offered to Catholics to write. Catholics who have been successful in the secular publishing field have, generally speaking, not been impeded with any great burden of knowledge and conviction of the Catholic ethic and dogma. Catholics thoroughly impregnated with Catholic thought could not write for the great secular periodicals, which are made up of stories and essays from which religious influence is rigidly excluded. The convinced Catholic, not having the neutral mind, negative to ethic and revelation, simply cannot write for the negative, neutral, pagan magazine. But I say the opportunity to write exists. It must exist when there is a need.

Here is a body of people, reported to number some twenty millions, living in a great society of perhaps 150,000,000 souls, most of whom have no supernatural understanding whatever. This is an astonishing phenomenon. What do these Catholics think the supernatural is? What influence has the supernatural on their daily actions? How does the supernatural explain to non-Catholics what Catholics do? These are questions that demand answers drawn from observa-

tion. They should be answered in good narrative and essay forms. They should be answered truthfully.

Until they are answered truthfully and vividly in literature we will not know what effect our Catholic schools are having. We will not have any sympathetic understanding on the part of non-Catholics of the attempts of Catholics to live according to supernatural standards. Without genuine portrayal we will not be believed, and until we are believed we may not hope for conversions.

There are the issues. We need to believe in what we are trying to do by looking honestly at the way we are doing it. We will, I am confident, win the sympathies of non-Catholics, if we admit how we fail to achieve what we are taught to do. We will convince no one by covering up our deficiencies.

Of course, the development of writers depends on what people read. A fashion must be set. Now when I was in school, little more was offered to us in the way of English Catholic literature than the works of Cardinal Newman. Then came Chesterton and Belloc. Fortunate were they who were interested in these styl-ists. Of late various Catholic publishers have been presenting to us other Catholic writers, mostly English. A few American Catholics have read the works of these authors.

But they are English. They are good for background. They do not, except in the most remote way, explain America to Americans. As an exclusive diet they tend to form in politics, economics, and general social problems an un-American mind among Catholics. Belloc, I think, would be the first to admit this. He does not pretend to know America, and he knows our country better than do most foreign writers. Moreover, Chesterton is dead. Belloc is elderly. He cannot be expected to carry on the battle long. There are not others to fascinate as they have done the intelligent and enthusiastic Catholics in this country.

But there can be. The stories are here to be told. The problems are here to be discussed. America is rich for literary exploration.

Who are the publishers? Do not worry about the publishers. Write literature for God's sake and He will find an opening. If what is written shall be read by only a few at first, it will have effect and live. There is no demand for Catholic literature created by Americans because it is not thought of. It is not expected. But literature cannot die. It will bear fruit, if it is literature. Belloc and Chesterton wrote for years and were renowned and appreciated before they were recognized by Catholic periodicals and their contributions requested. The reward and the recognition will take care of themselves if the worthwhile work is done. I will try to suggest topics for stories and essays by asking some questions: What religious thought comes out during the table talk in your home? What do you think are the fundamental principles of the American system of government? How do the Catholic politicians you know honor their stewardship? What do you read? What do your relatives and friends say about the Catholic school teachers? What religious doctrine has the most influence on you? What do you know about the history of your parish and why? Of your diocese? Do you know any Catholic members of labor unions? If so, what do they know about Catholic principles regarding labor? What do you think is the greatest problem of the Church in America? Are you afraid to talk about your religion to non-Catholics? What do you find the hardest part about remaining a practical Catholic? Do the Catholics do well because they are motivated by religion or because doing the right thing seems reasonable to them? What do Catholic young men do to get ahead in the world?

In the field of American history the background of American Catholicism remains to be written of honestly as Belloc has written of the English background.

I submit that Catholics in America do not know the history of America, much less the history of Catholics in America. What is known is too pretty a picture to be believed. Too many Catholics have evidenced a flippant contempt for representative government and the Constitution for me to believe that there exists a well-informed Catholic attitude of appreciation for the blessings derived by Catholics under the American form of government.

In view of the fact that the Church does not explicitly prefer one form of government to another, insisting only that all civil authority is derived from God, it seems to me the height of impertinence for Catholic dupes of foreign propagandists to attempt to change the American form. This problem should be discussed openly and fearlessly. Unless Catholic writers discuss it in the open, resentful non-Catholic Americans will drag the truth out of us.

If we had nothing else we could have narratives by Catholic writers in which they could tell what they were taught about our nation in Catholic schools, colleges and seminaries. That idea suggests another. Let us have stories on what has been taught and is being taught in our schools and colleges on various subjects. Let us hear how subjects are taught. It might even help to make us more realistic about our religion to have reviews of the sermons heard during a year.

These suggestions, if followed, may not immediately produce writers of the first rank, but they will form a background out of which powerful writers may emerge. For power can be drawn only from reality. We cannot realize ourselves if we read only what seems remote from our daily lives. We cannot develop the supernatural life and its appreciation if supernatural activity is allowed to seem artificial and idealistic instead of realistic. There is nothing so real as revealed truth.